

Wednesday  
13 Sept '78

## From Our Readers

### Silver Reef residents speak out

Dear Sir:

As residents of Silver Reef, this letter is being written as a reaction to the article on the front page of your September 7th edition relative to the activities of Bennett Petroleum opposing the 5-M, Inc. operation at Silver Reef.

We speak officially only for ourselves, but we are rather certain that our feelings are shared by most, if not all, of the residents now living at Silver Reef.

Last week we received a letter, completely unsigned, in an envelope with no return address, which letter contained almost verbatim the information contained in the news article referred to above. Apparently this letter was mailed to all property owners on the Reef and addressed to them at Leeds, Utah through actually the great majority of them live elsewhere and their addresses are completely unknown to the local postmistress. Quite frankly, the content of the letter disturbed us, as it did our neighbors to whom we have talked about it. As we saw it, we were being "excited" to the degree that we would take some sort of action to further the selfish purposes of Bennett Petroleum, even though we don't know what those purposes are or even who is Bennett Petroleum. The only contact we have had has been

this very peculiar anonymous letter.

Now let us make it crystal clear (and here we know we speak for all of the property owners on Silver Reef) that we would much prefer that nothing whatsoever further be done in the way of mining or in any way disturbing our area, as we like it just the way it is. We do, however, realize the extent of our rights as private property owners as it relates to those who own adjoining property.

The real intent of this letter is to correct the half truths, the inferences and the complete untruths contained in the letter we received and in your news article. (1) The Local principals of 5-M, Inc. have been in touch with the actual residents of Silver Reef with some frequency, explaining in considerable detail what their plans are, and these informal visits were culminated several weeks ago with a rather formal meeting wherein they brought all of their applications and maps and correspondence dealing with their mining plans in this area and met with a l of the residents who were interested in coming. They went into complete detail on their plans and their timetable and opened themselves up to any questioning, answering these questions with complete

candor. As a result of this meeting we have legal and binding assurances that there will be no mining beneath the private property under the residences or any of the now vacant lots in the Silver Reef development, nor will there be any mining or other activity which will affect the visual attributes of the old White Reef in the line of sight of any Silver Reef resident.

We feel that the 5-M people have been most cooperative and have been completely open and above board with us, while on the other hand the only thing we have heard from Bennett Petroleum is this very peculiar anonymous letter filled with "unfacts". Quite frankly we, and those other residents, to whom we have talked, feel very uncomfortable and in fact suspicious of the as yet unknown intentions of Bennett Petroleum.

Be assured we have no "ax to grind" with either of these organizations. In fact, we would prefer, as afore stated, that the whole area would stay just exactly like it is, but we feel rather comfortable with the 5-M operation because we know what they are going to do and this is more than can be said for Bennett Petroleum.

Mr. & Mrs. J.M. Forsha  
Silver Reef Residents

### Radioactivity Is Dangerous

The chemical elements of uranium and plutonium are closely related. Uranium, in the process of nuclear explosion, irradiates and increases the radioactivity of

The underground nuclear explosions that have taken place, over the years, in Nevada (and in other places) are certain to have produced radioactivity in the subsoils

percentage of minerals-in-solution, the groundwater-through its "dissolved load"-becomes radioactive (literally poisoned) when and if it comes into contact with

Proposal  
dangerous

To the voters of Washington Co.:

The resolution creating the Special Services District to handle garbage disposal may contain dangerous facets of which you are not aware. To list a few:

1. It is at first to be implemented by a bond of seven hundred fifty thousand dollars to get it started on which you may vote.

2. There is to be a monthly charge for garbage pick up, whether or not you need or want it, to start at four dollars per month which they tell us is conservative and knowledgeable trucking companies agree that what is specified in this resolution cannot be done for that amount therefore, the monthly cost will rise to no telling what amount.

3. This also provides that should the cost of the service not be covered by the monthly charge, said Control Board shall have the power to levy special taxes on all taxable property which if

## County v choices in

At 8:00 p.m. the 1978 Primary Election became history in Washington County, and, though no one was sure yet who they were, two local and one state candidates important to county residents had been chosen.

On the Republican side of the ballot the choice was between Incumbent Howard Smith Commissioner, 2 year term, and Challenger Lyman Gubler, both of whom reside in Eastern Washington County. For a Nov. candidate for County Attorney, voters had the choice between Incumbent Ronald Thompson and Challenger Paul Graff whose major challenge had been related to the office budget.

Democrats faced a choice between Peter Cooke and Ed